

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed 22 Nov 2005.

Claims 1-36 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

Specification

1. The Examiner has objected to the specification for having an abstract longer than 150 words.

Applicants count only 126 words in the abstract, which is well within the number allowed by the rules. The abstract also does not appear to contain language which is appropriate only in claims, and does not merely repeat the title.

Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 36 has been objected to as informal. Applicant's have amended the claim to correct the informality, and

request that it now be allowed.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 17, 20, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Henneuse et al., U.S. Patent 5,963,913 [hereinafter, Henneuse.]

Henneuse describes a system where an event is schedule during a time when a plurality of individuals are available. That this is the Henneuse calendaring environment is clear from a careful reading of the abstract and all of the remaining specification: a single meeting or event is being scheduled at a time when a plurality of all, or some selected subset of all, invitee individuals are available.

Applicant's invention, on the other hand, provides a way for a plurality of meetings with a plurality of invitee individuals to be scheduled in response to a single request broadcasted, or distributed, from a primary user to the plurality of invitee individuals. Those invitee individuals then respond to the invitation by accessing a calendar template containing the times made available by the primary user on the calendar of the primary user. As each invitee

individual accesses the calendar template and selects from the available times a time for his individual appointment, the selected time is removed from the calendar template so as not to be available to invitee individuals subsequently responding to the single request and accessing the calendar template.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, 20, and 36 to clarify this distinction, support for which is provided in the specification as originally presented at page 5, lines 14-21, and page 6, line 22 to page 7, line 7.

Applicants request that these claims 1, 17, 20, and 36 now be allowed.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2-16, 19, and 21-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Henneuse as applied above, and further in view of Scully et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,831,552 [hereinafter, Scully].

These claims all depend from claims 1, 17, 20, or 36 and are distinguished from Henneuse as discussed above.

These same distinctions also pertain to Scully. That is, Scully is also directed to establishing a time for a meeting, that is for calendaring "an event" or "the meeting", for which a plurality of individuals are available. See Col. 3, lines 15-20 and Col. 23, lines 45-60, and so forth.

With respect to claims 2 and 21, these claims depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively, and are distinguished from the combination of Henneuse and Scully as previously described. Neither Henneuse nor Scully, individually or in combination, teach the concept of a primary user issuing a meeting invitation to a plurality of invitee users who respond by sequentially accessing a primary appointment template originally specifying the times which the primary user is making available for these meetings and which is modified as each invitee user responds by removing the selected time from those times which are available.

The Examiner takes official notice [Office action, pages 9-10] with respect to blocking out specific times. Applicants demur on this point, but traverse the subsequent assertion that the combination of Henneuse and Scully teach blocking out unavailable times "for meetings". As noted

above, both of these references are specific to identifying a time for "a meeting" or "an event", and not to the sequential scheduling of a plurality of meetings in response to a single invitation against a dynamically updated primary appointment template initially containing times available to a primary user (the requester of the meetings) and subsequently modified as each appointment is sequentially entered.

With respect to claims 3, 8-19, and 22, applicants traverse the assertion of the Examiner that Henneuse teaches scheduling a "plurality of meetings", or that Henneuse and Scully teach such. As previously noted, Henneuse, as also Scully, teaches finding a time for an event, and not times for a plurality of meetings in response to a single request, as previously explained with respect to independent claims 1, 17, 20, or 36, and dependent claims 2 and 21.

The Examiner takes official notice [Office Action, page 11] with respect to scheduling/blocking of periodic/recurring meetings. The Examiner also states [Office Action, page 12] that "it is common for people to schedule/block recurring/periodic team meetings... common set of repeating calendar events/meetings." On both points,

applicants traverse. These claims are directed to sequentially blocking available times responsive to selection of times by each individual invitee to a single invitation, and the concept for which official notice is taken has no bearing on the concepts set forth in the claims.

With respect to claims 4-16 and 23-35, applicants traverse the Examiner's apparent reading of Henneuse as scheduling "one or more" appointments. Nowhere in applicant's claims is the phrase "one or more" used, and that is not what is being claimed. Further, as previously explained, Henneuse is scheduling an event, not a series of events or appointments in response to a single invitation with available times removed from the template as each individual invitee responds and selects a time for his appointment from that template.

Further, applicants traverse the Examiner's official notice [Office Action, page 13, lines 11ff and page 18, lines 4-6] insofar as such is applied to applicant's claims. Applicants are not merely blocking other users, but sequentially removing available times from a template accessed in response to a single invitation to schedule

individual appointments against times made available on that template. However, if the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit attesting to the statement [Office action, page 13, lines 11-16, repeated at page 18, lines 4-6] pursuant to 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

With respect to claims 5-16 and 24-35, the same discussion as with respect to claims 4 and 23 apply.

Further with respect to claims 12 and 31, applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-16, 19, and 21-35 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-35.


The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of

the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Leska, et al.

By


Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 22 Feb 2006

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Patent Attorney
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545

Correspondence Address:

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901